

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 4-6, 12-14, 20-22, 29-31, and 58 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 7-11, 15-19, 23-28, 32-57 and 59 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-11, 15-19, 23-28, 32-57 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,664) in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 7,188,151). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, 26, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55 been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., pages 16-17 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

partitioning the acquired one or more of audio information and video information into lengths of partitioned data each of which corresponds to a predefined time interval;

compressing and packetizing the lengths of partitioned data into a stream of first data packets having empty regions resulting from the compression of the partitioned data;

...  
multiplexing the stream of first data packets with the second data packets by inserting each respective plurality of second data packets into one of the empty regions of the stream that is adjacent to its corresponding respective plurality of first data packets[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Fernandez nor the relied on sections of Kumar disclose or suggest partitioning

acquired audio information into lengths of partitioned data each of which corresponds to a predefined time interval. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Fernandez nor the relied on sections of Kumar disclose or suggest partitioning acquired video information into lengths of partitioned data each of which corresponds to a predefined time interval. Further, neither the relied on sections of Fernandez nor the relied on sections of Kumar disclose or suggest compressing and packetizing lengths of partitioned data into a stream of data packets having empty regions resulting from the compression of the partitioned data. Still further, neither the relied on sections of Fernandez nor the relied on sections of Kumar disclose or suggest multiplexing a stream of first data packets with second data packets by inserting each respective plurality of second data packets into one of the empty regions of a stream (that result from partitioning acquired audio information and/or video information into lengths of partitioned data each corresponding to a predefined time interval and compressing the lengths of partitioned data) that is adjacent to its corresponding respective plurality of first data packets.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Fernandez nor the relied on sections of Kumar, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the information transmission method set out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 9, 17, 26, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpts of claim 1. Claims 9, 17, 26, 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55 are therefore each patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Fernandez and Kumar at least for the same reasons.

Claims 2-3 and 7-8 depend from claim 1, claims 10-11 and 15-16 depend from claim 9, claims 18-19 and 23-25 depend from claim 17, claims 27-28 and 32-34 depend from claim 26, claims 36-39 depend from claim 35, claims 41-44 depend from claim 40, claims 46-49 depend from claim 45, claims 51-54 depend from claim 50, and claims 56-57 and 59 depend from claim 55. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Lawrence  
E. Russ/  
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

1105742.1.DOC